

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,263	12/31/2003	Lisa Leighton	LEIGH-018A	8486
7590 07/01/2005			EXAMINER _	
Kit M. Stetina, Esq.			MEISLIN, DEBRA S	
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER Suite 250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
75 Enterprise			. 3723	
Aliso Viejo, CA	A 92656			

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$\omega$	_			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/749,263	LEIGHTON, LISA				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Debra S. Meislin	3723				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence ac	ddress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutively received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, by within the statutory minimun will apply and will expire SIX (e, cause the application to bec	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will be considered time 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this c ome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. communication.			
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 A	A <i>pril 2005</i> .					
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠	Claim(s) 3 and 7 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 3 and 7 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideratio					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received ts have been received prity documents have au (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	d. d in Application No been received in this National	Stage			
Attachmen		_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		rview Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date		ce of Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/749,263

Art Unit: 3723

1. Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 3 and 7, "consisting" should be changed to --- consisting of---.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White in view of Ruhlander et al, Harriss, and Bollinger.

White discloses all of the claimed subject matter except for having a generally elliptical-shaped handle, a one-piece valve key, and a pair of cavities adapted to receive a 5/16 inch and a ¼ inch wide valve stem.

Ruhlander et al discloses a generally elliptical-shaped handle. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form the handle of White as generally elliptically-shaped to enable to tool to be gripping and rotated as taught by Ruhlander et al.

In accordance with MPEP 2144.03(V.)B.

"In re Larson, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965) (A claim to a fluid transporting vehicle was rejected as obvious over a prior art reference which differed from the prior art in claiming a brake drum integral with a clamping means, whereas the brake disc and clamp of the prior art comprise several parts rigidly secured together as a single unit. The court affirmed the rejection holding, among other reasons,

Application/Control Number: 10/749,263

Art Unit: 3723

"that the use of a one piece construction instead of the structure disclosed in [the prior art] would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice.")"

Harriss discloses a one-piece valve key "36" in figure 2 thereof. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form the valve key of White as a one-piece valve as taught by Harriss as such would have been an obvious engineering choice.

Bollinger discloses a socket that includes a pair of square cavities. See figures 4-7 and column 3, lines 9-10. Bollinger discloses that a variety of combinations of socket sizes may be used to accommodate various needs or uses. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form the device of White with a pair of square cavities to enable the engagement of various sized torque transmission elements as taught by Bollinger. The common knowledge that valve stems/sockets are 5/16 inch and ¼ inch is admitted prior art because applicant has failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form the plural sockets of White as modified by Bollinger with standard sizes related to valve stems such as 5/16 inch and ¼ inch cavities as such sizes are known in the art.

- 4. Claim 7 may be given favorable consideration if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
- 5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/749,263

Art Unit: 3723

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

- 6. Applicant's arguments filed April 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra S. Meislin whose telephone number is 571 272-4487. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Debra S Meislin Primary Examiner Art Unit 3723